

The University of Chicago

THE BEARING
OF SECULAR KNOWLEDGE ON
RELIGIOUS THINKING
IN ISRAEL

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1936

By
GUY JOHN WRIGHT

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1939

The University of Chicago

THE BEARING
OF SECULAR KNOWLEDGE ON
RELIGIOUS THINKING
IN ISRAEL

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1936

By
GUY JOHN WRIGHT

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1939



PREFACE

The purpose of this thesis is simply to trace the development of the material and secular aspects of Israel's culture, especially from the reign of Solomon to the Persian period, and then to indicate some ways in which that technical development influenced Israel's religious thinking. The sources from which this study will be made are primarily the Bible,¹ the historical and cultural records of nations round about, and the findings of archaeologists. The conclusions of scholars on the various fields will be used as subsidiary sources where they supplement the primary sources at hand and where their writings are significant because of a broader knowledge of the particular field.

The term "Israel" is used of that people who contributed to mankind that religious philosophy which has made the Old Testament a living book of religion throughout the ages. It is used to include the people of both nations into which the kingdom of Solomon was divided. Israel then is not a racial but a cultural-national term as used here. It is like the popular use of the term "American" in the United States today, a name applied to all who are recognized as full citizens of the nation. The origin of the Israelites is so much in dispute that it would be unwise to commit oneself to any theory without more space than could possibly be given to it here. The same is true also of the source theories of the historical corpus, Genesis to Kings. Volumes have been written on each of these subjects and are easily available.

¹Unless otherwise stated, Biblical quotations are taken from An American Translation.

It is necessary to define the expression "religious thought," in distinction from other thought. The distinction is one of end, not means. Religious thought is that mental process which seeks the achievement of the highest values of a culture from all its relationships. It might be called a philosophy of life, although the Israelites were not philosophers in the Greek sense. Israel's thought was not by defining concepts and analyzing the processes of thought, but was more direct and intuitive. By this mental process the Israelite sought to secure the higher values for himself and the others of his group. When they thought of their God as a part of their group, they sought the same values for Deity as well. As the culture developed and was modified, the values of life changed, thus the content of religious thought was not static but a living, growing set of current ideas relating to a range of values. Religious thought therefore operates in two areas: (1) for the conservation of the abiding values of the status quo, and (2) by criticism of the status quo to aid in the achievement of a better culture with higher values. It is apparent, then, that periods of political or economic pressure when old values are threatened and new relationships with possible new values are appearing, are the periods when religious thought would be at its peak. Thus the techniques of the secular life as they developed modified the culture level of the people, of which religious thought was an element.

It is not to be inferred that the development of the techniques of the secular life was the only influence on the development of culture or religious thought, or even that this technical development was the dominant element. It is simply the element singled out for study here. The thesis is not that the development of techniques produced religious thought, but that

the techniques helped in the achievement of that culture in which religious thought was possible, and then by their presence conditioned and modified the form in which that religious thought expressed itself. The products of the technical skills, as representations of thoughts, were a powerful factor in stimulating the building of idealogical structures.

The amount of information available on certain aspects of Israel's material culture at some periods is not as great as one would wish. Added evidence is being brought to light continually by the many excavations in Palestine and nearby lands. It is hoped that more conclusive evidence will eventually be found on many subjects, but sufficient information is at hand to warrant an attempt to make a reconstruction of technological progress and to evaluate its influence on the religious outlook of this people, Israel.

An expression of appreciation is in order. Yet to name all who have assisted in the program of studies that finds expression in this research project is obviously impossible. The writer can not refrain from a word of appreciation to the librarians at both the Divinity School and the Oriental Institute, and to several members of the staff of the Institute. He is heavily indebted to Dr. W. A. Irwin, under whose guidance the project was conceived, organized and carried to an advanced stage, and to Dr. W. C. Graham whose assistance in the closing stages of this project have been invaluable.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

CHAPTER VIII

THE TECHNIQUES AND ISRAEL'S RELIGIOUS THINKING

It must be recognized at once that techniques do not produce religion or religious thought, but techniques do modify culture, of which religious thought is a part. The products of the techniques, as they are used both in the secular life and the religious practices, do have influence on the direction of religious thought and the terms in which religious thoughts are expressed. This is not to say that there is a mechanistic relationship of techniques and religious thought but that there is a stimulating influence of things as a part of the culture on religious thought. Religious thought must of necessity be expressed in terms of the culture within which the thinker lives, although it may be in opposition to some features of that culture.¹ This does not mean that the element of inspiration is eliminated from religion either in its origins or development. It does mean that inspiration as it operates in religious thought will be related to the culture pattern in which the thinker lives.

There might appear to be little relationship between the geographical extent and governmental technique of the nation or nations, and Israel's religious thinking, since their knowledge of the world was ever more extensive than their possessions. Yet political conditions, national stability, tranquillity, and power must ever have been a vital influence on religious practice and thought. Perhaps one of the clearest illustrations of this is

¹W. C. Graham, The Prophets and Israel's Culture (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934), p. 34.

in the matter of the temple. Even before Solomon, when the king was established in a national capital, there was a desire for a permanent temple but the statement is ascribed to David that it was wars that prevented.¹ Solomon also gives wars as the hindering cause with his father, in his message to Hiram, when he did establish Jerusalem as the religious capital.² But the establishment of a national religious capital was only one of the effects of national importance. It also brought Israel to a consciousness of the importance of their God and religion among the gods and religions of nations round about. Yahweh, by that time, if not before, became the God of a nation.

The division of the Kingdom likewise was an important influence on religious thinking. Even allowing for the Yahwistic prejudice of the Biblical writer toward the rival nation, there can be no serious doubt that the official establishment of the young bulls as symbols of deity in the national sanctuaries had a powerful influence on the religious thinking. Even if Macalister be correct in his position that this was not an innovation but a sign of conservatism on the part of Jeroboam, it nevertheless helped to fix forms of thought, as any reactionary movement is likely to do.³ It is not at all certain that the influence was all for the retarding of the inception of the high prophetic religion. Perhaps the reaction against this type of idolatry spurred the Yahwists forward in the development of moral monotheism. The struggle of the high and moral with the old non-moral that became immoral,⁴ was long and precarious.

¹I Chron. 17: 1-6; 28: 2-3. Cf. II Sam. 7:1.

²I Kings 3: 2-4; 5: 3-5; 8: 1-9: 4.

³R. A. S. Macalister, A Century of Excavation in Palestine (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1925), p. 281.

⁴R. A. S. Macalister has emphasized the fact that the wor-

According to the book of Kings, both Rheoboam and Abijam continued the idolatry of their father. The division of the kingdom does not appear to have been a matter of religion, as both Petrie¹ and Garstang² suggest, for both north and south set up idols, officially.³

Macalister's characterization of Asa as the king who introduced morals into their religion,⁴ is an exaggeration, although his good administration probably did encourage religious development, especially on its moral side. However it was not good government alone that stimulated religious thinking. Periods when the very life of the people was being crushed by individual or governmental oppression⁵ as well as when the life of the nation was in danger from without,⁶ were likewise periods of progress in religious thinking.

Another type of influence which a strong stable government

ship of fertility gods and goddesses was not in itself immoral but became so as the thought of the people advanced and the practice degenerated into the licentious; *ibid.*, p. 271.

¹W. M. F. Petrie, *Palestine and Israel* (London: S.P.C.K., 1934), p. 75. He says that David's exile in the south during the reign of Saul placed him under the influence of Benaiah and the Arabs, with whom El was more important than Yah. This Benaiah, an Arab El worshipper, who was captain of the guard, by securing the selection of Solomon as king rather than the elder brother Adonijah, was responsible for the final disruption of the kingdom.

²John Garstang, *The Heritage of Solomon* (London: Williams and Norgate, Ltd., 1934), pp. 175-177; Garstang says that it was the Elohist-Yahwist conflict, reflected as early as at Mt. Horeb, Exod. 32: 17 ff., which led to the final schism, but it is the Ephraimites who are Elohist and Moses is the leader of the Yahwists. The north was for El while the south was for Yah.

³I Kings 14: 22-24; 15: 3, 12-13.

⁴R. A. S. Macalister, *A History of Civilization in Palestine* (London: Cambridge University Press, Reprint 1921), pp. 88-89.

⁵Amos 2: 6-8; 3: 1-8; 5: 12-15; 7: 10-14; Isa. 5: 7-24; 28: 7-22; Neh. 5: 1-18; Zech. 7: 1-14.

⁶Isa. 31: 5; 37: 1-22; 30-32; 48: 17-22; 66: 6-23; etc.

had upon religious thinking is illustrated by the house of Omri in Israel. Although the Biblical accounts tend to deprecate this dynasty, even there, something of its true greatness is reflected. Omri bought the site for a new capital, and built a strong city there.¹ The remains of this city of Omri and his son, Ahab, still testify that the reluctant praise of the Judean writer² is not an exaggeration.³ This dynasty was so important that in Assyrian records, Israel, even under a new dynasty, was for a long time afterward known as the "house of Omri."⁴ The Moabite stone, too, admits the control of Moab by the house of Omri.⁵ It was during this dynasty that the prophetic school which had hitherto been chiefly a shadowy group, produced some outstanding individuals.⁶ That it had been the custom for the prophets in Israel to prophesy in an estatic state as the other prophets were prophesying when Micaiah came before Ahab, is farther attested by the Chronicler in that David set apart certain men to "prophesy with lyres, harps and cymbals who prophesied at the bidding of the king."⁷ But Elijah, and Micaiah were not that kind of prophets! While it may be, as Olmstead suggests,⁸ that there is need to revise our judgment as to the relative merits of the political theories of

¹I Kings 16: 24.

²I Kings 22: 39.

³Geo. A. Reisner, Clarence S. Fisher and David G. Lyons, Harvard Excavations at Samaria (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1924).

⁴D. D. Luckenbill, Ancient Records of Assyria (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1925), I, 211, 243.

⁵G. A. Cooke, A Text Book of North Semitic Inscriptions (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1903), pp. 1-3.

⁶I Kings 17: 1 ff.; 22: 8 ff.

⁷I Chron. 25: 1-3.

⁸A. T. Olmstead, History of Palestine and Syria (New York: Chas. Scribner Sons, 1931), pp. 359, 384-387.

the prophets and kings, there can be no serious doubt that these prophets introduced a new emphasis in Israel's religion. Nathan's relationship with David¹ looks in this direction, but it was one thing to tell David that he had sinned, and quite another to condemn the autocratic Ahab, husband of Jezebel. There are some features of the message of these prophets that appear strange to-day, as the testing of the relative power of Yahweh and Baal at Carmel;² and the lying spirit sent by Yahweh to deceive Ahab.³ Jack says that the conflict of Elijah was not one concerning ritual offenses, but over cruelty and injustice, imposed under the Tyrian influence.⁴ Heathenism, he says, not only meant religious, but also moral and social disintegration and retrogression, as well, and that it was the latter that called forth Elijah as the representative of Yahweh. This means simply that Elijah preached a protestant theology which arose in response to a social need. It was this need, unsatisfied by the old pattern, which stimulated the mind of the prophet, itself patterned by the old culture, to modify that culture pattern to satisfy the need. This illustrates why all reforms in theology and culture carry along so much of the old patterns.⁵

When one faces the puzzling problems of the conduct of some of the leaders of Israel, the fragmentary nature of the Biblical record is provoking. Oh that some excavator might find a copy of "The Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel!"⁶ Why did

¹II Sam. 12: 1-12.

²I Kings 18: 21-40.

³I Kings 22: 19-23.

⁴J. W. Jack, Samaria in Ahab's Time (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1929), p. 152.

⁵L. L. Thurstone, The Nature of Intelligence (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc., 1927), pp. xi-xvi, 1-23.

⁶II Chron. 25: 26.

Amaziah, after he had conquered the Moabites, set up their gods and worship them, rather than his own God, a God of victory?¹ He gave no explanation to the prophet, and none is given in the Bible. One is tempted to say it must have been some peculiar stimulus, an Edomite wife perhaps, that set in motion the mental processes back of his strange religious conduct. It is possible, however, that it was the old concept that each god must have worshippers. Even national monotheism was not fully established. Thus two phases of the old culture patterns clashed logically and Amaziah was influenced by the one phase and Ahaz by the other. The latter's conduct is easily understood. He was conquered by Damascus, and straightway closed the temple in Jerusalem and sacrificed to the gods of Damascus, saying, "Because the gods of the kings of Syria helped them, I will sacrifice to them, that they may help me."²

It was in a period of contrasts, abundance and poverty, religious fervor and yet religious dissatisfaction, that the line of the great writing prophets arose.³ These men, coming from various walks of life and different social strata, saw the unsocial use that was being made of the relatively rich resources, and the consequences to the social structure and political security of Israel. They conceived of Yahweh as the God of social justice and personal integrity. The message of the three earlier men is summed up by the fourth, who came only a little later:

You have been told, O Man, what is good,
And what the Lord requires of you:
Only to do justice and to love kindness,
And to walk humbly with your God.⁴

¹II Chron. 25: 14-16.

²II Chron. 28: 23-25.

³Amos 1: 1; Isa. 1: 1; Hos. 1: 1; Mic. 1: 1.

⁴Mic. 6: 8. The authenticity of this verse is questioned by some scholars, but I find no sufficient reason to reject it.

Although at least some of these great eighth century prophets came forward in a time of peace and prosperity, it must not be assumed that they saw no dangers on the political horizon. Without exception, they saw that political disaster was inevitable,¹ and at least Isaiah lived to see Samaria fall and the armies of the enemy encamped about Jerusalem.² They were keen observers of the world in which they lived, saw the inter-relatedness of nations, and exalted personal living to a new height in religious thinking. It was a new height but it was not free from the old pattern. Those who did the thinking were so much a part of the past that much of the old pattern remained. The new was new largely in terms of its social implication.³

Perhaps part of the credit for the religious awakening in the last quarter of the eighth century should be given to Hezekiah. The Chronicler here enlarges considerably on the writer of Kings.⁴ The religious reorganization especially is treated by the later writer. The motivating influences of this reform are unknown, but it seems probable that the object lesson at Samaria may have been at least a contributing factor. Perhaps it was the spirit of Isaiah beginning to have effect. The zeal of Hezekiah for Yahweh reestablished the Passover, organized the priests and Levites for service and made provision for their support.⁵ This must have

¹Amos 8: 1-14; Hos. 9: 1-9; 10: 9-15; Isa. 36: 1-37: 15; Mic. 4: 11- 5: 1.

²S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923), p. 205.

³Note that Amos 3: 2 retains the old concept that Israel is the "chosen" people but contrary to the dominant belief that this assures deliverance, he insists it seals their doom.

⁴II Kings 18: 1-20: 21; II Chron. 29: 1-32: 31; cf. Isa. 36, 37.

⁵II Chron. 30: 11-27; 31: 1-20. while allowance is made

been an important factor in establishing the priesthood in the position they held in the reign of Josiah.

The permanent value of Hezekiah's reform efforts are problematical because of the reaction under Manasseh. To interpret that reaction is difficult. That the whole situation is a clash of cultures is apparent, and the conduct of that king, especially his religious thinking, can be understood only in the light of his social situation. His was a thoroughgoing attempt to secure the desired values by the old technique under the old Canaanite social and political philosophy. In some respects he may have been one of the greatest influences for the new philosophy of life by showing the implications of the old in such vivid light that the clash of cultures was made more apparent. At any rate it is only to this king and to the one who preceded Hezekiah, among all the later kings of Judah, that human sacrifice is definitely ascribed.¹ Josiah is reported to have destroyed the place where such sacrifices were made.² The conduct of these kings must be viewed in terms of their culture pattern. From the social viewpoint of our day there would be little difference between the human sacrifices of Manasseh and the killing of the priests of the high places and burning their bodies on their altars by Josiah.³ From the culture viewpoint of their day these acts were worlds apart.

The influence of the conquest and exile, and likewise of the return of the few that came back, was certainly very great.

for the priestly coloring of Chronicles in details, it nevertheless is valuable for its preservation of a general cultural situation in broad general outline.

¹II Kings 16: 3; 21: 6; II Chron. 28: 3; 33: 6; cf. Ps. 106: 37-38.

²II Kings 23: 10.

³II Kings 23: 19 f.

"Judah's loss of sovereignty in 586 B.C. proved to be a blessing to the idealistic religious elements of the nation."¹ This statement illustrates the fact that crises are not only times of trial but also times of opportunity as well. As Graham points out, the freedom from the political control made the achievement of new culture patterns more simple, and resulted in two lines of development, Ezekiel's idea of separation from the world, and the concept of second Isaiah that Yahweh was to be sovereign of the world.² Henceforth the emphasis of Israel is ceremonial and moral conformity rather than national prowess. As they saw the old ideas fail of materialization³ new ideas were produced to take their place. Much space could be given to the development of this point but one or two examples must suffice. In the book of Zechariah, under the symbolism of a flying roll, the message was delivered that guilt would no longer be visited upon society or the nation, but upon the houses of the individual evil doers.⁴ Again the prophet was asked concerning the observance of sorrowful fasts that had been observed in the past,⁵ because of the misfortune of the nation.⁶ The answer was given in terms of the moral and righteous living which the Lord desired.⁷ Another example is in Malachi, where the attitude of the people was one of carelessness, apparently born of disillusionment.⁸ The glowing expectation kindled by earlier prophets had not materialized as quickly as expected, which brought a new focal point in the thinking of that prophet. The

¹W. C. Graham, "The Religion of the Hebrews," *JR*, XI (1931), 256.

²*Ibid.*, pp. 256-257.

³Driver, *op. cit.*, p. 357.

⁴Zech. 5: 1-4.

⁵Zech. 7: 1-4.

⁶Jer. 52: 12-14.

⁷Zech. 7: 9-10; 8: 16-19.

⁸Mal. 1: 2, 6-8; 3: 13-15.

ceremonies of Israel were to be kept accurately and with spiritual perception if the promised glories were to be enjoyed.¹ The political conditions were vital factors in the prophet's thinking, as indicated by the reference to the governor, and the relative position of Edom.²

It was during the reign of Hezekiah, but in the northern territory, that a new element was introduced into the religious thinking of the territory of Palestine, and that by act of the Assyrian government when Samaria was repopulated.³ These people brought their own gods, but asked to be instructed in the worship of Yahweh. A priest was supplied, from those who had been taken to Babylon. Thereafter these new settlers worshipped both their old gods and Yahweh as well. The influence of this on the religious thinking of later Israelites can only be surmised.

Only a few words more need be said on the influence of the state of the nation and the technique of government, on religious thinking. The division of the nation, set in motion two tendencies, or rather gave to each an added impetus for they had already begun. Exclusiveness was a keynote of the Yahwists in Judah and syncretism a keynote in the north. Yet both influences operated in each area. Graham suggests that the difference in psychology between the north and south was due to their experiences in relation to a common culture concept which regarded extent of territory as a sign of divine favor. Upon this basis, the early success of Judah over Israel fixed upon the north the habit of demanding success of its kings. This probably played a part in the many changes of dynasty. This frequent change of dynasty

¹Mal. 3: 7 ff.; 4: 4-5.

²Mal. 1: 2-5, 8.

³II Kings 17: 24-41.

made difficult the close relationship of kings and priests that existed between the priesthood and the kings of the single southern dynasty. The northern kingdom knew no such experience as the long regency of Jehoida,¹ the high priest, a reign that began by a religious covenant that tied political and religious emotional loyalties together.² Such a period and the reign of Uzziah whose religious devotion and zeal was so great that he exercised his priestly function,³ must have gone far in the establishment of the best Yahwism in the minds of the people of Judah. The later success of the north over the southern kingdom tended to fix the idea of a unique Davidic Messiahship as their integrating center. The hope of the south was in a family, which led to a sense of unity and distinction. The hope of the north was in success, and so they disintegrated rapidly under the stress of adversity. The prophetic line came to its flower in Judah, not in the northern territory, although the earlier prophets, Elijah, Elisha, and Micaiah operated there.⁴ Thus it appears that the nature and extent of the nations were major factors in the development of the religious thinking of this people, Israel, by means of the place the nation held in their whole cultural thinking.

While political conduct must be evaluated in terms of the current culture pattern, the criticisms and interpretations of political acts help in the establishment of a new culture pattern, in which future political acts will have new values. Religious thinking is that process of criticism and interpretation which

¹II Chron. 23: 1- 24: 2.

²II Chron. 23: 16.

³II Chron. 26: 16.

⁴I Kings 17: 1 ff; 19: 16 ff.; 22: 8 ff.; II Chron. 18: 7 ff. The exception to this limitation is found recorded in II Chron. 21: 12 where Elijah is said to have written a prophecy concerning Jehoram.

is ever seeking new values as religion seeks to conserve the abiding values of the past. Thus political history influences religious thinking toward the production of a new religion, not one that is severed from the past, but one that is an improvement of the religion of the past. It is not especially a change of phraseology, but a change of content within the phraseology.¹ "Shepherd" may signify one who has the right to kill for his own pleasure, or one who "lays down his life for his sheep."

The relationship between animal or agricultural husbandry and religious thinking is difficult to determine, since there is no evidence that any considerable advancement was made in the type or technique in either husbandry. These occupations influenced religion as items of international commerce. This means that Israel thus became involved in the business and economics of the world in which they lived. By this activity they would be compelled to consider the dominant philosophy of life of the world about them. This commerce likewise was a considerable element in the achievement of prosperity which, as the prophets insisted, led more and more to conformity to the world.² The Rhodian jar handles found in all strata of Israelite culture in many places in Palestine³ are but one indication of the importance of agricultural produce in commercial relations. There can be no doubt that then, as in every age, religion was intimately related to the economic aspects of the culture in which religion operated as another aspect.

¹Amos 3: 2.

²Isa. 2: 7-8; Jer. 4: 30; 9: 23; Hos. 13: 6; Amos 3: 10-14: 3; Mic. 2: 1-2; Zeph. 1: 10-11; et passim.

³J. W. Crowfoot, "The Expedition to Samaria-Sebustiya. The Forum Threshing Floor Area," PEFQS (1932), p. 66; and Macalister, A Century of Excavation in Palestine, p. 240.

Both agriculture and animal husbandry are most significant to religious thinking as they come into the sacrificial system of the Israelites. The offerings of the Israelites were both animal and agricultural, in fact the offerings to God were the same as they themselves ate. The significance of the clean and unclean is a problem too large to be treated here.¹ Why the dog which was known from early antiquity was not used for food, or the camel that came in later,² why only animals with cloven hoof and which chewed the cud were clean³ - for both God and man - is at present an unsolved problem.⁴ If there could be found a genetic relationship between the "cult of the dead" and Israelite sacrifices,⁵ then an explanation of the close similarity of man's food and his offering to Yahweh is suggested. That there was among the Israelites something of the idea that the gods were anthropomorphic is indicated by the statement that the women were weaving tunics for the Asherah, apparently in the sacred area of Jerusalem,⁶ in the reign of Josiah. Thus they identified these images with themselves in the need for clothing as well as food. Of course this leaves as problems the matter of human sacrifice as a possible reminiscence of cannibalism, and the absence of fish and game from their offerings. These latter, Kennedy thinks, were excluded as

¹Johs. Pedersen, Israel, Its Life and Culture (London: Oxford University Press, 1926), pp. 482-484.

²Cf. supra, pp. 7-25. (This reference is to the complete dissertation, which is in the University of Chicago Libraries.)

³Lev. 11: 1-47; Deut. 14: 3-20.

⁴For bibliography on this subject see W. I. Wolverton, "The Eighth Century Prophets' Idea of Holiness," University of Chicago, Ph.D. Dissertation, 1934, pp. 92-96.

⁵Cf. Graham and May, Culture and Conscience, pp. 53ff., 65, 75ff.

⁶II Kings 23: 7.

being already the possession of the deity, not reared by, or in the care of man.¹

By the time Israel first came clearly into history, they had become both an agricultural and pastoral people. The groups that came in from the east and southeast were probably predominantly pastoral, but even before their entrance they had likely begun that borderland type of agricultural existence. In Canaan, the agricultural, settled life became more important. In this transition, the influence of the agricultural religion, long established in Canaan, upon these Israelites was very great. Just how great this influence was is today a subject of sharp dispute, but it was sufficiently strong that it was an important element in Israelite religion to the time of the great prophets, and they used its terms² in their fight to eradicate the fertility centers, the high places.³ This battle was not won until after the exile, and sublimated remnants have remained in Judaism and Christianity even to the present. Even such features as the horns of the altar may be vestigial remains of a bull worship, either from the fertility cultus of Canaan or an earlier pastoral religion. The feasts of Unleavened Bread, closely connected with Passover, the Feast of Weeks or Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles were all closely related to agriculture, and quite likely had their origin here. Thus the constant practice, even with little improvement, of agricultural and animal husbandry, had an important bearing on

¹A. R. S. Kennedy, "Sacrifice and Offerings," HDB, p. 813.

²Isa. 5: 7; 58: 8-11; Ezek. 34: 1-23; Hos. 2: 2-13; 6: 1-2; Zech. 1: 10 ff.; cf. W. C. Graham, The Prophets and Israel's Culture, pp. 35-40; "Notes on the Interpretation of Isaiah 5: 1-14," AJSL, XLV (1929), 167-178; "Some Suggestions Toward the Interpretation of Micah 1: 10-16," AJSL, XLVII (1931), 237-258.

³Isa. 57: 3-13; Jer. 2: 3, 21; 7: 28-32; 17: 1-3; 48: 35; Ezek. 6: 1-14; 16: 16-52; 20: 27-44; Hos. 10: 8; Amos 7: 9; Mic. 1: 5-7.

religious thinking. The influence is twofold. First, it brought Israel into contact with the dominant culture patterns of the East Mediterranean world, in which the religious philosophy of the masses was expressed. Second, the few souls who were to be leaders, tried to relate the practices of the old pattern to the needs of the whole of life. In times of economic pressure, when the common needs were not forthcoming, they criticised that old pattern, analyzed it to find its weaknesses which made life unbearable, and then attempted to correct those weaknesses. Thus it was not agriculture and animal husbandry as such that influenced religious thinking, except in terms of conformity, but the culture pattern or philosophy of life in which they had part, plus a mind and plus social stress, led to real religious thinking. Amos saw that it was not ritual offense but conceit in thinking that by their ritual they could exercise this divine prerogative that had caused Yahweh to withhold the rain and send blight and mildew and pestilence.¹

The culture patterns of the old world, like those of every age were not simple ones but had many divergent elements. The mention of the Rechabites indicates a long persisting tradition that Israelite religion had its origin in a pastoral environment,² while the mention of horses given to the sun³ looks to a cult practice far different from that which tradition has ascribed to Israel. They were a part of the culture setting in which Israel did its religious thinking.

The coming of metals was an important epoch in the life of any people, and anything that so vitally affected culture, inevitably affected religious thinking. It would be almost impos-

¹Amos 4: 4-10.

²II Kings 10: 13-29; Jer. 35: 1-19.

³II Kings 23: 11.

sible to think of ancient Israelite religion apart from the brazen altar, and yet it was necessary to call in a Tyrian to make that altar. That first great teacher of the art of metal working must have introduced much of his Tyrian religious symbolism also. The pomegranates and chains, and the two pillars are probably only outstanding examples.¹ By the elaborate ornamentation of the temple and its rich furnishings, the whole emotional attitude to the God for whom it stood would be exalted. People could not think of the God of such a temple, as they would of a God whose place of worship were a tent or open air altar. The ritual of worship likewise would be materially changed by the apparently elaborate set of utensils used in the worship.² The development of the metal techniques made possible a more elaborate ritual as well as the enrichment and beautification of the whole setting in which it was celebrated. This metal used in the equipment did not, of itself, stimulate thought. The use to which metal was put, in a social setting for which it itself was partly responsible, conditioned the thinking of all who entered the sanctuary. Metals affected both directly and indirectly the life and thought of Israel. On some, it merely had the effect of confirming them in the habits of thought which matched this system. But to others, stimulated by political pressures and social tensions, the metal itself became a symbol of a system inadequate for the resolution of such tensions. The prophets, being the kind of men they were, criticized constructively.

While the mass of people came only rarely to Solomon's temple, it would, by that fact perhaps, be even a more powerful stimulus to new thinking. Even the ornaments of the surrounding

¹I Kings 7: 13-22; II Chron. 3: 15-17.

²I Kings 7: 40-50.

buildings, the shields of gold, the throne of ivory overlaid with gold, and the calves' heads and lions,¹ formed such a background that it would have been impossible to worship Yahweh as their ancestors did while wandering as semi-nomads. Such a display of the precious metals as is indicated in the details of Solomon's buildings² would undoubtedly either exalt the deity that was so honored, or would make him repellent to the people who were taxed to make such display possible. That both reactions did take place is indicated by the popular place that the king and his temple held in the memory of later generations,³ and the consequence of the next king's refusal to relieve the tax burden.⁴

This elaboration of worship in the acceleration of which metals played a part manifested itself, inevitably, in an increase in the number of the cultus personnel especially at Jerusalem. That had something to do with the emergence of the law of the central sanctuary which is one of the striking regulations of Deuteronomy,⁵ for this priesthood at Jerusalem became influential enough at court to bring about, for a time at least, the closing of other sanctuaries.

This tendency toward the primacy of the Jerusalem cultus had, however, had its beginnings with the erection of Solomon's temple and had played a part in influencing thinking in earlier crises. The elaborate temple at Jerusalem became the symbol of the divine sanction of the Davidic house and it helped to sharpen

¹I Kings 10: 16-20.

²I Kings 6: 31- 7: 51.

³Ezra 3: 11-13; 5: 11-14; Prov. 1: 1; Song of Sol. 1: 1-8: 12; Isa. 6: 1; 64: 11; Jer. 50: 28; 52: 17-23; Matt. 12: 42.

⁴I Kings 12: 1-20.

⁵II Kings 23: 8; II Chron. 34: 1-33; Jer. 7: 17 ff.; Jeremiah sought to limit priestly function to the priests at Jerusalem; 11: 1-17.

the cleavage between the north and the south which arose originally from the social tensions caused by the economic exploitation by means of which it had been built. Even though at that time, and indeed until Deuteronomic times, other sanctuaries were recognized, still the material superiority of the Jerusalem cultus accelerated centralization to an extent which alarmed the north and caused it to revert, under Jeroboam I, to a rite which it considered native.¹ This resulted in making Yahweh the official deity of two states and had much to do with building up in the thought pattern the idea that his sovereignty could be extended over other deities by covenant rather than by conquest. For the north considered Yahweh its God just as did the south. In a word the Jerusalem temple had much to do with establishing a nationalistic thought pattern in that entire area.

The technique of metallurgy had by this time been acquired to the extent that Jeroboam did not need to call on outside help to make his golden bulls for worship.² It was in this rather than in a change of symbolism that the setting up of the calves at Dan and Bethel was different. It was not a far step from the calf head decoration at Jerusalem,³ to the calves of Jeroboam. This use of metals was common with succeeding kings as shown by the destruction of idols by the few kings who opposed them, as well as by direct evidence of their construction.⁴ As the skill increased, the esthetic element must have improved, although the evidence of such development is strangely lacking in the archaeological finds of Palestine. An effect of the working of metal on religion is seen in the account of the Damascus altar, probably

¹I Kings 12: 26-27.

²I Kings 12: 28-29.

³I Kings 10: 19.

⁴II Kings 11: 18; 17: 10-12; 18: 4; II Chron. 28: 2.

metal since it replaced the old brazen altar, although it may have been of stone.¹ At least it shows a technical skill that resulted in a great change in the temple arrangements. The introduction of such altars and the modifications of the ritual by kings not especially loyal to Yahweh perhaps contributed somewhat to the reaction toward priestly legalism. Yet there is evidence of conservatism in the matter of ritual implements from early times for there are indications that flint knives were used in ritual ceremonies long after metals were in general use.² This prejudice against metals was breaking down in the time of Solomon, for metal tools were used in the temple construction, that is, in the preparation of materials, though not at the temple itself.³ It had so completely broken down by the time the historical books were written that the provision for flint knives was not included in the record, although their use was mentioned as a command of Yahweh at the crossing of the Jordan.⁴ The Nasbeh flints indicate that they were still used at some places down to the time of the actual writing of the "JE" literature.⁵ The changed viewpoint must have been generally accepted to prevent such a regulation being included in the official legislation.

The story of Hezekiah's destruction of the Nehustan, the bronze serpent ascribed to Moses, shows that bronze objects influenced the religious thinking of at least part of the Israelites.⁶ He destroyed this icon because it was being worshipped, although the text implies that sacrifices had been offered to it continuously until that time. That the Israelites associated this image

¹II Kings 16: 10-18.

²Cf. pp. 26-27.

³I Kings 6: 7.

⁴Josh. 5: 2-3.

⁵"Notes," BASOR, No. 27 (1927), p. 16.

⁶II Kings 18: 4.

with the widespread Canaanite serpent symbolism¹ is not even hinted, and yet the conclusion seems inescapable that herein lies the motivation of Hezekiah's iconoclasm. That such a symbol was used by the Canaanites is certain from the serpent stele found in the Canaanite level at Tell Beit Mirsim, and the evidence of such symbolism at Beth-shan.² The tradition of this bronze serpent, of which the Mosaic origin is left unquestioned in the text, but whose actual origin is unknown, must have gone far in its influence to retard the progress of the tendency toward the idealism of the prophets.

Not the least significant of the uses of metals on the religious thinking of Israel, was its use in warfare. The general attitude of that age toward gods, both on the part of the Israelites and other people of the Near East, is too well known to need discussion here. Thus any element which gave a nation or people prestige or success in either peace or war, was vital to religion. The element of strategy, and the ability to take advantage of natural conditions as assistance from Yahweh continued to play a large part in Israel's wars, but the use of weapons of metal certainly afforded great aid after metals were introduced into the economy. Thus not only the attitude toward their deity was affected, but the welfare, if not the very existence of a nation depended on some ability to use metals effectively, in a metal age. The mention of metal weapons in all parts of the later writings illustrate the important place metals had in the military life of this

¹Albright, "The Second Campaign at Tell Beit Mirsim (Kirjath-Sepher)," *BASOR*, No. 31 (1923), p. 6; M. G. Kyle, *Excavating Kirjath-Sepher's Ten Cities* (Grand Rapids: W. B. Ferdmans Pub. Co., 1934), pl. 128; A. Rowe and L. H. Vincent, "New Light on the Evolution of Canaanite Temples," *PEFQS* (1931), p. 20, n. 5; cf. Graham and May, *op. cit.*, p. 83 for additional treatment.

²A. Rowe, "The 1927 Excavation at Beisan," *MJ*, XIX (1928), 164.

people.¹ Thus metallurgy was important to religious thinking even though they made no great contribution to the field of metal trades.

The influence of metals on the general culture was very great as Vincent pointed out several years ago.² Graham and May have well indicated the effect of culture on religion in the valleys each side of Israel as well as in Canaan itself.³ It is necessary then only to call attention to the large place that metals came to play in the commerce and industry of the Israelites to show the influence of skill with metals on religious thinking. A few statements from the prophets will serve to enforce this point. Amos accuses Bethel of selling "the innocent for silver,"⁴ and "buying the poor for silver."⁵ Zephaniah says,

.... there will be the sound of a cry from the Fish-Gate,
And a wail from the New Town;
.....
For all the people of Canaan shall be ruined;
All who weigh out silver shall be cut off.⁶

Isaiah also said their land was full of silver and gold but that it led to idolatry and not humility before Yahweh.⁷ Thus from the protestant viewpoint, the knowledge and use of metals in commerce and trade had an adverse bearing on Israel's thought of their God.⁸

The refining of metals is often used as a figure for what Yahweh would do with this people in purging them of social and

¹The fact that Zedekiah wore horns of iron in predicting Ahab's victory in war is interesting.

²H. Vincent, Canaan D'Apres L'Exploration Recente (Paris: J. Gabalda & Cie, 1907), p. 403.

³Op. cit., p. 59.

⁴Amos 2: 6.

⁵Amos 8: 6.

⁶Zeph. 1: 10-11.

⁷Isa. 2: 7-8.

⁸For bibliography on metals and commerce, cf. Graham and May, op. cit., p. 7, n. 5.

moral as well as theological imperfections.¹ Undoubtedly much of the influence of metals was that subtle type of influence that the paying of taxes to state or religion, with Israel almost identical, has on the development of the attitudes and emotions of individuals. Sometimes the taxes were voluntary, though rather well defined, at other times, specific and arbitrary.² The consequence of meeting or not meeting this obligation as it is stated by Malachi will indicate the influence of tithes and offerings on religious thinking.³

The bearing of architectural craftsmanship on religious thinking in Israel appears chiefly under three categories. The first of these, the building of a permanent place of worship or abode for the God has been treated under the discussion of metals, for metals helped to make it potent in religious thinking. That this temple building campaign was grounded in architectural knowledge is indicated by the fact that as soon as David had a house of his own he desired a house for his God.⁴ Macalister says the building of a temple was an innovation to Semites for they were wont to worship rather at a high place.⁵ But he also says the temples of Jeroboam and his bulls were according to the custom of his people, not an innovation.⁶ There is probably no contradiction in his thought, however, for he appears to speak of temple in the latter instance as a place of worship rather than a building. But it was probably not the building of houses alone that

¹Isa. 48: 10; Zech. 13: 9; Mal. 3: 2-3.

²II Kings 12: 4; 15: 20; 22: 4; 23: 35; Neh. 7: 70-73; 10: 32.

³Mal. 3: 8-10.

⁴II Sam. 7: 1-2; I Chron. 17: 1-6.

⁵R. A. S. Macalister, A Century of Excavations in Palestine, pp. 271 ff.

⁶Ibid., p. 281.

produced the desire for a temple in the thinking of the people. The excavations of Palestine have shown that there were temples to other deities both before and during the monarchy.¹ The presence of such temples to other gods must have influenced the building of a temple as well as the type of thinking that approved it and followed from it. It was likely the Astarte or other Canaanite temples that were responsible for there being bedchambers in the temple of Yahweh.² If there ever was evidence of the use of these bedchambers for religious prostitution, with the approval of the temple officials, it has nearly all been eradicated from the historical corpus. There are some passages, however, where any other interpretation seems forced and arbitrary.³ That such conditions ever prevailed in the official national temple makes the building of that temple seem a movement for evil. But sacred prostitution was already widespread. The centralization of power in a king and court, of which the Jerusalem temple complex was a symbol, increased the overhead which society had to maintain. Under this pressure sacred prostitution became degraded as part of an exploitive technique under which the people suffered. The social evils of the practice, thus centralized and intensified, aroused the ire of the few who focused attention upon it and aided in its control.

The nationalization of the temple as the place of worship par excellence, gave to it and its appurtenances a dignity that had not been enjoyed by any similar sanctuary. In the days of Solomon, the altar was able to save Adonijah only for a little

¹S. Cook, "What Archaeology is Doing for the Bible," PEFQS (1936), p. 77, n. 4.

²II Kings 11; 2; II Chron. 22: 11-12.

³II Kings 23: 7; Isa. 8: 3.

time, and Joab not at all.¹ In the time of Athaliah, the temple had become so highly respected that even she was not killed until she was outside the sacred area.²

The second temple also was a powerful factor in the religious thinking of Israel. Whether or not one accept the position of Torrey³ that there was no return from exile, it nevertheless was a crucial point in Israel's religious thinking when a new temple replaced the old one.⁴ Perhaps one of the most consequential features of this experience was the refusal on the part of the strict Yahwists to accept the co-operation of the other residents of Palestine.⁵ This was not the beginning of particularism but it must have played a real part in the fixation of that spirit. The second temple was a symbol of that spirit after the reform of Ezra-Nehemiah.

Another avenue through which the temple at least indirectly affected religious thinking was in connection with the collection of the Psalms. Many of the individual psalms were perhaps in use at altars and high places before the temple was built. The temple provided a situation in which those psalms were able to fulfil a more impressive social function. This social situation resulted in the collection of the many old psalms and undoubtedly in the composition of new ones to meet the need of the cultus technique carried on there. While it is "human spirits touched by the divine" that makes men think of the worth of a civilization, those thoughts must ever be in relation to the social situation in which

¹I Kings 1: 50-53; 2: 13-24, 28-34.

²II Chron. 23: 14-15.

³C. C. Torrey, Ezra Studies (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1910), p. ix.

⁴Ezra 3: 7- 6: 18.

⁵Ezra 4: 1-4.

the thinking is done. Thus the temple, through the cultus it made possible, played a part in the collection of the psalms and the influence their thoughts have had on the thinking of later generations, a very powerful influence indeed.

The second category under which architectural ability affected religious thinking has likewise been mentioned in connection with metallurgy. It is the use of walls and citadels in time of warfare. This became so important in the life of the Israelites that they referred to their God, and the tenet of their religion, in terms of such material defenses.¹ These material defenses built up that feature of the theology which conceived of God as the defender of the state. Thus it is apparent how influential the building of fortifications was on Israel's religious thinking.

The third category is that of dwellings, private and official. It might appear that dwelling houses would not much influence religious thinking, but on further thought it is apparent that where people spend so much of life would influence the thought of one's relationships, which is religion. While archaeology reveals the type of dwelling, it is not able to reveal that subtle influence which these dwellings had on the thinking of the people, but the Biblical stories give some indications of it. The Rechabites had maintained a simplicity of religion and life by refraining from living in houses, along with other characteristics of a nomadic, pastoral life.² The social situation which caused Jannab to lay such a charge upon his descendants is unknown, but that it was a social situation in the time of Ahab or soon after is

¹Ps. 7: 10; 31: 2; 46: 7, 11; 61: 3; Prov. 18: 19; Eccles. 9: 14-16; Jer. 1: 15-19; et passim.

²Jer. 35: 1-19.

probable from the story of his status with Jehu.¹ It seems likely from that story that Ahab's house of ivory² lies in the background of this rule of Jonadab against houses. The beauty and richness of the "house of ivory" at Samaria is now made clear by the excavations there.³ The large amount of ivory objects, the diversity of style and workmanship, and its use in decorating toilet articles, walls, and furniture, help people today to appreciate the force of Amos' tirade against such buildings.⁴ The evidence is conclusive that the ivory work was imported, for the Samaritan house, and buildings at other sites.⁵ This may have had some influence on Amos' bitter denunciation.⁶ Amos also says the small houses will be destroyed as well as the large ones, but it is apparent that the large houses were the motivating force of the conduct that he condemned as anti-Yahwist.⁷ This influence is seen again in the first of the sixfold woes of Isaiah eight.

Woe to you who join house to house,
And add field to field,
Till there is no more room,
And you are left to dwell alone
In the midst of the land.⁸

Perhaps one of the most interesting connections of houses with religious thought, and one fraught with far-reaching possi-

¹II Kings 10: 15-28.

²I Kings 22: 39.

³J. W. Crowfoot, "Recent Discoveries of the Joint Expedition to Samaria," *PEFQS* (1932), p. 132; "On the Ivories from Samaria," *JPOS*, XIII (1933), 121-127; J. W. and G. M. Crowfoot, "The Ivories from Samaria," *PEFQS* (1933), pp. 7 ff.; "Twelfth Annual Report, 1931-32," *BSAJ*, p. 13; "Fifteenth Annual Report, 1934-35," *BSAJ*, p. 5.

⁴Amos 3: 15; 4: 1.

⁵W. M. F. Petrie, *Ancient Gaza III* (London: British School of Archaeology in Egypt, 1933), p. 11; W. F. Albright, "The Second Campaign at Tell Beit Mirsim," *BASOR*, No. 31 (1928), p. 6.

⁶H. G. May, "A Supplementary Note on the Ivory Inlays from Samaria," *PEFQS* (1933), p. 88.

⁷Amos 6: 11.

⁸Isa. 5: 8.

bilities, is that in which sheol is conceived as a house.¹ The evidence is yet in a nebular state, but seems to indicate the presence of the idea in Canaan long before Israel appeared there. That some of the idea is reflected in the Old Testament seems possible.²

The bearing of Israelite pottery on religious thinking is probably no more important in Israelite culture than the influence of their religious thinking on their pottery. The prohibition of the making of a likeness or image³ appears to have been taken seriously in the matter of pottery forms and decorations. That there was an influence of pottery on religious thinking is seen in two types of pottery objects.

Perhaps the pottery figurines are most important. Whether the five figurines of level B at Tell Beit Mirsim be Astarte or simply magic charms to hasten the process of childbirth or secure fruition in barren women is a small matter.⁴ The story of Hannah and her prayer in the temple at Shiloh indicates how closely childbearing was connected with the idea of religion.⁵ There were Astarte figurines in the A level at Tell Beit Mirsim, as at many other sites in the same period of Israel's occupation.⁶

¹Graham and May, op. cit., pp. 42-43, n. 37, and pp. 287-295.

²Ps. 139: 8; I Kings 2: 10; 14: 31; et passim.

³Exod. 20: 4; Lev. 26: 1; Deut. 4: 16; 5: 8; 27: 15; Ps. 97: 7.

⁴W. F. Albright, The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible, p. 111.

⁵I Sam. 1: 1-20.

⁶Albright, "The Second Campaign at Tell Beit Mirsim," BASOR, No. 31 (1928), p. 8; J. W. Crowfoot, "Excavations at Samaria, 1931," PEFQS (1932), p. 15; J. P. Naish, "Tell En Nasbeh," ibid., p. 206; J. L. Starkey, "A Lecture," ibid. (1933), p. 195.

Figurines of humans and animals were also found at Samaria;¹ pottery figures of doves were found at Tell en-Nasbeh² and Starkey reports the finding of pottery rattles, which he classes as funerary objects, as well as representations of the Egyptian gods, Bes, Ptah, Soker, Bast, Isis, and Horus.³ While Kyle raises the question as to the religious significance of the A level figurines at Tell Beit Mirsim,⁴ on the basis that they may have been only charms, since no other cult objects were found at that site, Albright tends to give them special significance by pointing out that they do not have the conventional hair dress.⁵ They represent the hair frilled in the "vernacular" manner, thus showing the immediate connection of these clay goddesses with their own culture.

Pottery was also related to Israel's religious thinking by way of ceremonial vessels. The discovery of ancient vessels identified as ceremonial foot washing equipment⁶ gives a detail of the washings in ceremonial cleansing not clearly stated in the Bible. The identification has been confirmed by the discovery of relatively modern vessels of similar pattern that are ceremonial footbaths. The type of laver in which David washed himself after the death of his child before he entered the place of worship is not stated, nor are we told what the lavers were made of, in which

¹Crowfoot, "Excavations at Samaria, 1931," PEFQS (1932), p.5.

²Naish, "Tell En Nasbeh, PEFQS (1932), p. 206.

³Starkey, "A Lecture," PEFQS (1933), p. 195.

⁴Op. cit., p. 76.

⁵Albright, The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible, p.122.

⁶G. M. Crowfoot, "Pots, Ancient and Modern," PEFQS (1932), pp. 179-180; cf. J. W. Crowfoot, "Excavations at Samaria, 1931," ibid., p. 14.

sacrifices were washed.¹ If they were pottery, then they influenced the references to figurative or symbolic washings.²

That pottery influenced religious thinking is seen also in the figurative way in which the potter's relation to his vessel is compared to Israel's relation to the nations,³ and Yahweh's relation to Israel.⁴ Even the distance which the masses fell short of the ideal is compared to the difference between fine gold and the work of the potter's hands.⁵ Thus in several ways the skill of the potter touches the religious thinking of Israel.

About the influence of the development of cloth making on religious thinking, it is very difficult to be specific. Yet there can be no doubt that there was an influence. Whether there was a curtain between the holy place and the inner sanctuary is open to doubt since Kings records the construction of doors there,⁶ while Chronicles indicates first that there was a veil to take its place,⁷ and then in the following chapter describes the doors that were there.⁸ There is no Biblical statement as to there being a veil in the second temple, and Ezekiel makes no mention of a curtain. The New Testament of course gives reason to believe that the holy place and holy of holies in Herod's temple were separated by a curtain.⁹

The priests wore a special garb for ceremonies from early

¹II Sam. 12: 20; II Chron. 4: 6; Ezek. 40: 38.

²Pss. 26: 6; 51: 2, 7; 73: 13; Jer. 4: 14; Ezek. 16: 9.

³Ps. 2: 9.

⁴Isa. 30: 8-17; Jer. 18: 1-17; 19: 1-13.

⁵Lam. 4: 2.

⁶I Kings 6: 31-32.

⁷II Chron. 3: 14; and Song of Sol. 1: 5 may be an allusion to such a curtain, but like Chronicles, is late.

⁸II Chron. 4: 22.

⁹Matt. 27: 51; Mark 15: 38; Luke 23: 45.

times. Just how early, it may not be possible to say because of the age of our sources, but certainly by the time of Solomon they would wear a special garb as they officiated in the sanctuary. After the earlier Pentateuchal legislation,¹ there is no more provision for priestly garments for priests of Yahweh until the latter part of Ezekiel.² There is a possibility that the "garments taken in pledge," that Amos says were spread out by every altar,³ were really ceremonial garments. That special ceremonial garb was worn by the priests of Baal is assured by the account of their destruction by Jehu.⁴ It is probable that a similar arrangement was made for the priests of Yahweh.

The wearing of sackcloth, either by priests or the people, generally had a religious significance. Joel calls the priests to spend a night in sackcloth.⁵ When Ahab humbled himself in sackcloth, the same stern prophet who had pronounced his doom was told that the sentence should not be executed.⁶ A similar deliverance came to Hezekiah and his people when he too humbled himself in sackcloth as the Assyrian army threatened.⁷ Both by precept and example, the Biblical writings record the religious significance of sackcloth.⁸

Since religion deals with the seeking of values and the satisfaction of desires in the relationships of life, there is surely something of religious passion in David's call to the "daughters of Israel" to

.... weep over Saul,
Who clothed you in scarlet daintily,
Who adorned your garments with gold and jewels.⁹

¹Exod. 28: 2-43; 29: 5-9; 35: 19; Lev. 8: 13; et passim.

²Ezek. 44: 17-19. ³Amos 2: 8. ⁴II Kings 10: 22.

⁵Joel 1: 13. ⁶I Kings 21: 20-29. ⁷II Kings 19: 1-35.

⁸II Kings 6: 30; Neh. 9: 1; Ps. 30: 11; Amos 8: 10; et passim.

⁹II Sam. 1: 24.

Likewise there is religious significance in the fact that Tamar, after several years of widowhood, removed her "widow's dress" and put on the "veil" that caused her to be mistaken for a temple prostitute.¹ Proverbs give added assurance that there was a special garb of prostitution.² In the account of Josiah's reform there is a verse that is difficult to render with certainty but the import is clear that women were making special garments for the fertility practices in the temple of Yahweh.³ Thus the weaving of cloth is related to this kind of religion and in the very temple of Yahweh. One other incident must suffice to show the importance of clothing as a conveyor of religious power. That is the transfer of the mantle of Elijah to Elisha.⁴ While this may be a late passage, it nevertheless shows that in the thinking of the writer, a garment could carry with it something of religious or magical power.

Thus clothing and the process of its production are a part of the culture of Israel. As it is related to the practices of others, it relates Israel to the culture patterns round about. Out of the culture patterns come the philosophy of life and the attempt to find the higher values. This is the origin of religious thinking. The kind of clothes worn, the attitude toward clothes, or the absence of clothes in a culture pattern where clothing is required, taken on meaning and stimulates religious thinking.

Both the ability to read and write and the ability to produce literature had a direct bearing on Israel's religious thinking. The full significance of the ability to write is difficult to state because of the uncertainty and disagreement con-

¹Gen. 38: 14-21.

³II Kings 23: 7.

²Prov. 7: 10-14.

⁴I Kings 19: 19-21.

cerning the source of that ability. If that ability were indigenous to an original pre-Canaanite group or groups, then the religious thinking too would be more nearly indigenous to that group or number of groups. If the alphabet and type of writing were gotten from others, either outside of or in Palestine, with that acquisition would naturally come also some of the religious thinking of that people from whom they borrowed. The ability to read gave access to the religious ideas of the other people who used the same type of chirography and dialect. Whatever the original source may have been, by the time of Solomon, the religious thinking of different people would be available to the Israelites by means of interpreters, of which David's Babylonian scribe, Shavsha, may be an illustration.¹ As the ability of the Israelites to read and write increased, the influence of the wider religious thinking would increase, for they would be more completely in rapport with the ideology of mankind. Literature is a product of society and in turn may help to produce a new society.

The early literary products of Israel are preserved only, or largely,² as fragments incorporated or rewritten in documents produced in later centuries. That the early documents influenced religious thinking in the following centuries is evident from the many citations made, from the writings of others.³ Most of the

¹I Chron. 18: 16; I Kings 4: 3; cf. *supra*, p. 82.

²The possibility is recognized that some of the Psalms may come down from that early period, and while incorporated in the collection of Psalms, are not essentially changed thereby.

³Exod. 24: 4; Num. 33: 2; Deut. 31: 9, 22; Josh. 10: 13; II Sam. 1: 18; I Kings 11: 41; 14: 19, 29; II Kings 14: 6; I Chron. 27: 24; 29: 29.

quotations are simply used without giving credit.¹

The great literary products J and E which were eventually incorporated into the historical corpus were undoubtedly written to influence the religious thinking of Israel. In fact the conclusion seems inescapable that the writers of the historical corpus were motivated primarily by a desire to bring all of Israel to a form of belief and practice that was conceived as the original ideal. They were written, in part at least, to check the religious apostasies that were repeatedly appearing. That these books which have been preserved to us, or the underlying documents from which they were largely compiled, were primarily written as literary productions or as histories, is inconceivable. The story of creation, Genesis 1: 1-2: 4a was not written simply to form an introduction, but was written to counteract the influence of the cosmological cults, by attributing the creation of life and the processes of reproduction to their own God even from the beginning as the "J" writer had already done. The author was not content to absorb into his religion as the province of his God what had been the province of others, but claimed priority. Thus he would be restoring his God to his original and rightful place and superimposed a clear cut monotheism and monistic world view upon the earlier pragmatic dualism. It is not assumed here, that the arguments of these ancient authors were always consistent or well founded. It is only held that each writer and compiler had a religio-social motive and presented his material in a manner designed to achieve such an end.

The generally accepted theory is that Josiah's reforms

¹It is impossible to determine all such early material, but probably one can include in such old material, a part of Gen. 49, "the Blessing of Jacob"; at least part of the codes, Exod. 21: 1-23: 19; 34: 17-26; "The Song of Deborah," Judg. 5: 2-31; and "David's Dirge over Saul and Jonathan," II Sam. 1: 19-27.

were based on Deuteronomy, a book recently produced and given its initial recognition when read to Josiah and then by him to the leaders of Israel.¹ It is not likely that this reform could have been as far-reaching or permanent without a written basis. This Deuteronomic literature also served to set in motion and give impetus to the tendency to make Israel the "people of a book," to establish a normative scripture.²

The coming of the writing prophets, too, illustrates the potency of literature on religious thinking. Beyond the statement that he himself gives,³ it is impossible to know with certainty the source of Amos' ideals. It is possible that his information about the conditions of the nations round about came to him orally. The same possibility exists for his knowledge of the history of Israel and the practices of that people. Written material may or may not have influenced his thinking, but there can be no doubt that it was the writing of his ideas that gave them a lasting influence on the religious thinking of his successors. The careful literary form of his oracles suggest that writing may have been a tool which he used to stimulate the application of constructive thought to the formulation of ideas. But for the art of writing, Amos would have been only an unpleasant experience in the life of Amaziah, an otherwise unknown prophet of Bethel,⁴ instead of being an important figure in the development of religious thinking.⁵

It must suffice here simply to say that the prophets gen-

¹II Kings 22: 8-10; 23: 1-3.

²II Kings 22: 13; 23: 3; II Chron. 25: 4; 35: 12; Ezra 3: 4; Neh. 8: 13-18; Mal. 2: 5-9; 4: 4; et passim.

³Amos 7: 1, 14-16; 8: 1. ⁴Amos 7: 10-14.

⁵W. I. Wolverton, "Amos as a Thinker" (Unpublished type-written thesis, M. A., Divinity School, University of Chicago, 1932).

erally were more influential on the religious thinking of their age and succeeding ages, because their prophecies were written. Some of them and their activities are noted in other literature than their own, but even those records had to be reduced to writing for permanent influence.¹ Probably then, as now, those who put their thoughts into written form wielded the greater influence on the thinking of even their contemporaries, both local and distant.

Whenever the transition from the Hebrew language to the Aramaic language was made, it was an important influence. Such a change of language meant that the old literature would lose its influence except for the very minor group who, for some special reason, would continue to know the old language. Probably a relatively small portion of Israel was able to read the Hebrew literature at any time, but that portion would be much smaller when Hebrew ceased to be the spoken language. This limitation of influence could, of course, be overcome to some extent by translation, but there is no evidence that a written translation was made in early times. That such a translation was made orally is the possible interpretation of the assistance which Ezra received as he read the law to the people.² Even though a translation were made, either orally or in writing, there would still be a real loss of influence for it is not possible to express always the exact shade of meaning in translating from one language to another. Thus language and its techniques, the ability to write and read, to produce and appreciate literature had a very significant bearing on the religious thinking of the Israelites.

¹II Kings 19: 2, 20; 20: 1, 11; 25: 8; II Chron. 35: 25; 36: 12, 21; Ezra 1: 1; 5: 1; 6: 14; 8: 3; Jer. 26: 18.

²Neh. 8: 1-8.

There is still another influence that the experience of Babylon brought to the Israelites. It is difficult to limit it to technical skill, although technical skill is a large part of it. Nehemiah, and likely others of the Israelites, had become courtiers in the court of Artaxerxes,¹ and there they came in contact with a new world of knowledge. That new world of knowledge had forced them to realize that the old world view was inadequate. It did not meet the needs of the new hour. That period in some ways corresponded to the age of science in which the world is suddenly a new sphere. In the time of the exile, and now, the old religious concepts are in terms of the old world view. Two avenues were open; (1) they could give up their religion as outmoded and no longer of value, or (2) they could rethink their religion in the new terms. They rethought their religion.

There apparently were those who tried to hold the old religion by defending the old world view. This is the conservatism of religion. But there were then, as there must be in any religious group that would live, some who were far-seeing, truly religious, enough to let their religion encompass the new world view. While it seems impossible to date with certainty the book of Proverbs or any major part of it, chapters one to nine seem to fit here. Wisdom and understanding are to be sought, not shunned.² They are the ideal of religion as well as of intellectualism. Certainly this is the time of Isaiah forty, where is presented the answer to the question implied about the contrast between the old narrow national view of Yahweh, limited to a small territory and a limited type of existence and the new larger, more cosmopolitan need. The world indeed was larger and more complex than

¹ Neh. 1: 11- 2: 8.

² Prov. 2: 1-6; 3: 13-21.

they formerly knew but their God was yet its maker and sustainer. The origin and meaning of the more complex knowledge and culture is not to be found in the idol cut from a tree, shaped and covered with gold by the co-ordination of workmen. This origin and meaning is to be found in the old God, Yahweh, who made all things, measuring and weighing, to the least detail. The crisis was met by a glorious enlargement of the God-concept to equal the enlarged world view.

A survey of the developing culture of the Israelites, especially in regard to the secular techniques, shows that Israel's development was on the whole very normal. The techniques of government were largely acquired from the older culture of Canaan, partly borrowed from their neighbors, with only a minimum that was unique to Israel. The techniques of agricultural and animal husbandry conformed to the pattern of their time and place, and they made little improvement in this area. Their ability to use metals came late in the metal age, but they appear to have learned quickly and used effectively the cultural, economic and military potentialities of metal craftsmanship. In the matter of architecture, the Israelites borrowed heavily from their neighbors, reaching a high peak of achievement in the reign of Solomon and another in the reign of Jeroboam II, but on the whole they contributed little or nothing to building craftsmanship. Their houses, temples, and fortifications have close parallels elsewhere. In the making of pottery they were inefficient and made no real contribution, except in the matter of jar handle stamping, apparently as a part of the governmental tax system. In the area of clothing and cloth making, Israel achieved considerable skill, but again made no outstanding contribution. In the art of writing, they borrowed from the general technique of their neighbors,

but produced a distinctive literary product in the historical corpus and the prophets. While the literature has its affinities with the culture and literature of its age, it is the marvel of literary scholars even to our day.

The bearing of this secular knowledge on religious thinking has been seen to be largely in terms of the part it played in the general culture pattern. While the distinctive element in Israel's religious thinking was that indefinite element that caused a few leaders to see new meanings and seek new values in the things and practices among which they lived, even their thinking on these new meanings and values was colored by the current culture pattern. The things they had and the practices they carried on, called forth religious thinking under the stresses of failure to secure the needs of bearable existence from the status quo. Knowledge makes culture, culture effects thinking, and thinking helps to place in culture new values which make possible advancement in religious thinking.

